

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

RANDALL STEVENS,

CASE NO. C22-5862 BHS

Plaintiff,

ORDER

V.

PIERCE COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

13 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Randall Stevens' unopposed
14 Motion to Amend Dkt. 14

15 Leave to amend a complaint under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a) “shall be
16 freely given when justice so requires.” *Carvalho v. Equifax Info. Servs., LLC*, 629 F.3d
17 876, 892 (9th Cir. 2010). “This policy is ‘to be applied with extreme liberality.’”
18 *Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting
19 *Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001)). In
20 determining whether to grant leave under Rule 15, courts consider five factors: “bad
21 faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, futility of amendment, and whether
22 the plaintiff has previously amended the complaint.” *United States v. Corinthian Colls.*,

1 655 F.3d 984, 995 (9th Cir. 2011). Among these factors, prejudice to the opposing party
2 carries the greatest weight. *Eminence Cap.*, 316 F.3d at 1052.

3 Stevens' motion is unopposed, Dkt. 15, and the Court concludes that granting
4 leave to amend is warranted. His Motion to Amend, Dkt. 14, is therefore **GRANTED**.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated this 3rd day of April, 2023.

7
8 
9 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
10 United States District Judge

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22